4th August 1932]

Compilation of a text book on hygiene for use in schools in the Presidency.

* 113 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have made enquiries that in the Bengal Presidency a text book in hygiene called "Swastya Raksha" compiled by an Ayurvedic physician has been prescribed for use in schools by the provincial Government with the approval of their Director of Public Instruction; and

(*b*) whether any competent person in this Presidency has prepared or has been asked by the Government to prepare a text book of that type for use in the Government and aided schools of this Presidency?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) There is no information about the book 'Swastya Rakhsa'; but books on hygiene prepared by competent persons have been approved by the Text Book Committee for use in schools.

Prescription of a book on health for use in schools.

* 114 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have prescribed any book or books dealing with health to be taught in the middle or the high schools; and

(*b*) whether the Government have arranged or are arranging for the publication of such books by competent medical men?

A.—(*a*) Government do not prescribe text-books for middle or high schools.

(*b*) No; but Government understand that several books dealing with health suitable for use in schools are published by private firms and have been approved by the Text Book Committee.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Forest Panchayats

Forest panchayats in North Arcot district.

115 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of forest panchayats constituted in the North Arcot district;

(*b*) whether there is any Government Order specifying that half the amount of fine and compensation collected by the forest panchayats should be given to the concerned panchayats for their improvements;

(*c*) whether any circular was issued by the Government to give effect to the order;

(*d*) whether the order so issued was subsequently held in abeyance, if so, for what reasons;

[4th August 1932

(e) whether it is a fact that the Government are enforcing the forest panchayats to pay annually half the amount, and in many cases the full amount of moiety of compensation and fine collected in addition to the lease fixed in accordance with the provisions of the agreement entered into by the Secretary of State and the panchayatdars;

(f) whether it is a fact that panchayatdars are forced to pay the fine and compensation amount without consulting the panchayats and acting on their views; and

(g) whether it is a fact that by the enforcement of this taxation most of the panchayats are unwilling to work?

A.—(a) Ninety.

(b) & (c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to G.O. No. 1541, Revenue, dated 11th August 1930, which has been placed at the disposal of the press.

(d) In January 1932, the Government ordered as a measure of retrenchment that the payment of the amount should be stopped until the rent payable to Government by each panchayat had been revised after taking into account its estimated receipts on account of such payment.

(e) The Government are not aware that the facts are as suggested, but are enquiring.

(f) The Government do not understand the question.

(g) The Government are not aware that this is so.

Forest panchayats in North Arcot district working on a deficit balance.

116 Q.—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government will be pleased to call for a list of forest panchayats in the North Arcot district working on a minus balance;

(b) whether the Government are willing to encourage such panchayats by way of granting remission in lease amount whenever there is a fall of income;

(c) whether any order was issued to enhance the lease amount by the full amount of moiety of compounding fees in the case of panchayats which are working satisfactorily;

(d) whether it is a fact that in respect of certain panchayats in the North Arcot district the Collector has directed that the lease amount should be enhanced by the full amount of moiety;

(e) if so, what they are; what the benefit derived is by the panchayats by such enhancement by the full amount; and

(f) whether it is a fact that moiety of compounding fees has not been paid to many of the panchayats for over three years in the North Arcot district?

4th August 1932]

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government do not understand what the hon. Member means by panchayats working on a minus balance. His attention is invited to the Standing Orders on Forest Panchayats (which have been published). These give the policy of the Government in regard to such panchayats and the principles adopted in fixing the lease amounts. If any panchayat needs financial assistance it can make a representation to the Collector and the Board of Revenue.

(*c*) The answer is in the negative.

(*d*) & (*e*) The Government have not the information.

(*f*) The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clauses (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) of question Nos. 115, 177.

Irrigation

High level channel for irrigating the Murungapettai area.

117 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have sanctioned the utilization of water from the high level channel for irrigating the sanded fields in the Murungapettai area, Trichinopoly district; and

(*b*) whether it has been put into execution; if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The Government approved, in March 1931, an estimate amounting to Rs. 73,000 for the excavation of the Puduvaithalai High Level Channel for the irrigation of the sanded areas of the Murungapettai block in the Trichinopoly district and made provision for it in the Budget Estimate for 1931–32.

(*b*) The scheme has been postponed on account of the present financial stringency.

Flood discharge in the Pennar bridge.

118 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the maximum flood discharge in Pennar bridge on road No. 14 for the past ten years?

A.—The Government have not the information, but have called for a report.

The Tungabhadra Project.

119 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) at what stage the Tungabhadra Project stands;

(*b*) at what stage the negotiations with the Nizam's Government stand;

[4th August 1932

(c) whether it is a fact that nearly a decade ago a note was received from the then Chief Engineer of Irrigation of Nizam's Government that if both the Nizam and Madras Government agree the Tungabhadra Project could be successfully carried out to the advantage of the famine stricken zones in both territories;

(d) whether that note suggested the construction of a storage reservoir at Hoonoor mutty;

(e) whether that note mentioned that the charge per commanded acre would not exceed Rs. 9;

(f) whether the Nawab expressly mentioned that to utilize the great gift of nature, the Tungabhadra river, to the best advantage, the following works should be started:

(i) a storage reservoir of sufficient power at Hoonoor mutty;

(ii) Bellary Project on the British side eventually tailing into the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal but not contemplating any large supplementing of waters of Pennar for irrigation in Nellore district;

(iii) utilization of the fall that cannot be conveniently taken advantage of for irrigation purposes towards the development of power which is another way of protecting the country from famine;

(iv) necessary enlargement and extension of Cuddapah-Kurnool canal for the requirements of the tract which can be brought under command; and

(g) why the project is being delayed?

A.—(*a*) It is under correspondence with the Bombay, Mysore and Hyderabad Governments.

(*b*) The Hyderabad Government have not given their final reply to a reference from this Government in regard to the utilization of the Tungabhadra waters and their participation in the project.

(*c*) *to* (*f*) No such note can be traced in the records of the Madras Government.

(*g*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clauses (*a*) and (*b*).

Territorial Changes

Proposal, if any, for the transfer of certain taluks from North Arcot district to South Arcot district.

120 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal to exclude any of the taluks from the present North Arcot district and add them to South Arcot;

(*b*) if so, what they are;

(*c*) whether there is any proposal before the Government to add Tiruvannamalai and Chengam taluks now attached to the North Arcot district to South Arcot;

(*d*) whether the Collectors of Salem, Chittoor and North and South Arcot districts have been consulted in the matter and if so, what the opinions offered by them are;

4th August 1932]

(e) whether the Government are aware of the fact that Kangundi Kuppam Zamindari area which was once attached to the North Arcot district has been added to the Chittoor district on the representation of the Zamindar of Kangundi Kuppam; and

(f) whether Kangundi was added to the Telugu district—Chittoor, as it was a Telugu-speaking estate?

A.—(a) *to* (c) The Board of Revenue has been asked to examine the possibility of abolishing the Chittoor district. A tentative suggestion has been made to transfer the Tiruvannamalai and Chengam taluks from the North Arcot to the South Arcot district.

(d) The Collectors of the districts concerned have been consulted. The Board's report on the subject has just been received.

(e) A major portion of the zamindari was transferred from the North Arcot to the Chittoor district. The zamindar was in favour of the change.

(f) Yes.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I have to announce that the Madras Cotton Control Act of 1932 received the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General on the 17th June 1932."

III.—THE ORISSA COMMITTEE REPORT.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The House will now resume the discussion on the amendment of the Raja of Bobbili. Mr. Patnaik will continue his speech."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—" Sir, I was dealing with the historical aspect of the question. I was referring to paragraphs 54 and 55 of the Committee's Report at page 20. It is as follows:—

'It is believed that the Lion dynasty which from about A.D. 473 ruled Orissa for more than six centuries, extended its sway over the neighbouring tract of Ganjam. This dynasty was overthrown in the 12th century by Chonango Deo, the founder of the Gajapati line of kings. The domains of the Gajapati kings certainly extended beyond the river Kistna and their power was at its height in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries. The wild nature of the country in Ganjam, however, rendered their administration merely nominal and it is probably for this reason that they established their servants as Lords of the Marches to keep in check the aboriginal tribes of Khonds and Savaras, who as late as the 18th century still occupied portions of the plains. Some of the present zamindars claim descent from the Gajapati kings, and the gazetteer of the district written in the seventies of the last century, states that the Rajas even at present still acknowledge the Raja of Jaggannath or Puri as their chief. Most of the zamindaris are still held by Oriya families.

'In 1560 the last of the independent kings of Orissa was defeated and slain by the Muhammadans, and from about 1571 Ganjam which formed part of the Chicacole Circar was controlled by them from Hyderabad. In 1753 it was assigned by the Subedar of the Deccan to the French.'

"From this it is clear that Ganjam was an integral part of the Province of Orissa for a very long time. It was only when there was